

VZCZCXRO7223
OO RUEHFL RUEHLA RUEHMRE RUEHROV RUEHSR
DE RUEHNO #0248/01 1971135
ZNY CCCCC ZZH
O 151135Z JUL 08
FM USMISSION USNATO
TO RUEHC/SECSTATE WASHDC IMMEDIATE 2074
INFO RUEHZG/NATO EU COLLECTIVE PRIORITY
RUCNOSC/OSCE COLLECTIVE PRIORITY
RUEHMO/AMEMBASSY MOSCOW PRIORITY 6008
RUEHVEN/USMISSION USOSCE PRIORITY 0487
RUEKJCS/SECDEF WASHINGTON DC PRIORITY
RUEKJCS/JCS WASHDC PRIORITY
RUEAIIA/CIA WASHDC PRIORITY

C O N F I D E N T I A L SECTION 01 OF 02 USNATO 000248

SIPDIS
NOFORN

E.O. 12958: DECL: 07/09/2018
TAGS: [KCFE](#) [PARM](#) [PREL](#) [NATO](#)
SUBJECT: NATO: JULY 8 MEETING OF VCC EXPERTS

REF: A) SECSTATE 72067

Classified By: CDA Richard G. Olson, Jr., for reasons 1.4 (b and d)

11. (SBU) SUMMARY: At the July 8 Experts, Meeting each of the papers on the agenda was basically approved with a few tweaks, and in accord with U.S. guidance. The IS Staff will prepare revisions for all of these papers and circulate them for further discussion as needed at the next meeting on September 15. It was also agreed that except for issues tabled in Vienna, these papers, intended to promote discussion at next year's Annual Implementation Assessment Meeting (AIAM), will not be tabled in Vienna before the next AIAM, and will be tabled at the AIAM by the original NATO drafting state. Two new discussion papers (joint papers by Hungary and Italy) were handed out for future discussion in the fall. The next meeting will be on September 15 before the VCC on the same day. END SUMMARY

12. (C) Vienna Document (VD) Implementation Coordination. Several Allies made similar suggestions to those in the U.S. guidance which were agreed. Paragraph 7.2 and 8 will be united into one. Paragraph 5.2 will be removed. Specific points suggested by the U.S. in regard to procedures for compensation for states losing opportunities because of uncoordinated activities by non-NATO states will be added. In addition, the revised paper on VD coordination will be titled to represent all future years, not just 2009, and will contain mention of internal NATO review of the procedures every year. The staff also noted that at some time in the future we will probably want to readdress mechanisms for some coordination procedures with non-NATO states.

13. (C) Duration of an Evaluation Visit. After a fairly long discussion, it was agreed that the revision to be prepared by the Staff would be more explicit in terms of tying the "stop" in time for travel to total time of two or three hours. The idea of completing evaluations within 12 hours (minus any uncounted travel time) and in one working day was retained. In addition, the measure will be more expressly stated as a voluntary measure. The Germans read a Russian proposal recently made in Vienna that identified limits on total accountable travel time, and raising the 12 hours to 14 when excess travel is discounted. It was apparently agreed that the Russian proposal was not exactly what we were seeking, but needed clarification, and France agreed to request clarification in Vienna.

14. (SBU) Briefings. In spite of some back-and-forth confused discussion, the paper was basically retained as in. The next revision will be explicit in such things as the fact that the briefings are not just by "commanders." But also be their representatives, and, in accord with U.S. Guidance, it will be made clear that the level of detail may be less if a

real-world operation with operational security considerations (as opposed to training activities) is or planned to be underway.

¶15. (C) Evaluation Quotas. The paper was basically accepted as a voluntary measure, and the revised version will have few changes. States were requested to report back on whether they were willing to accept added voluntary evaluations, as the Staff felt that the paper would be more persuasive to others if NATO states expressed their willingness to do so. Germany reported that a Russian team leader had recently stated to a German team that Russia would be prepared to accept and go along with a future Chairman,s Statement increasing evaluation quotas and the size of inspection and evaluation teams.

¶16. (SBU) Size. Inspection and Evaluation Teams. The paper was basically accepted as a voluntary measure, and the revised version will have few changes.

¶17. (SBU) Digital Cameras and GPS. Again, the paper was basically accepted. The revision will make it clear that host states will be prepared to provide GPS for use if they have denied a request by the inspecting state to use one.

¶18. (SBU) Remaining Discussion Issue Papers. Staff noted that there are a few without volunteer drafters and requested states to consider volunteering. The U.S. suggestion that in the absence of a drafting volunteer state, an issue would eventually be dropped from the list was accepted. Meanwhile at this meeting two papers prepared jointly by Italy and

USNATO 00000248 002 OF 002

Hungary on a Common Understanding of Articles 81 (Sensitive Points), 82 (Third Party), and 98 (Briefings) and Concrete Parameters on Area for Inspections were handed out and will also be distributed electronically. These papers will be on the agenda for discussion at the next meeting.

¶19. (SBU) In response to comments on several papers, it appeared to be agreed that when a state wanted to exercise a voluntary right it should include that in the notification of intent to conduct an evaluation or inspection. Finally, the Staff chairman stated that the fall schedule was now firm. There will be VCC and VCC Experts, Meetings on September 15, October 28, and December 18, with an experts, meeting (only) on November 17.

OLSON